

BRIDGEPORT, CONN.
TELEGRAM

M - 12,425

MAR 23 1972

Congressman Rebukes Aide for CIA 'Leak'

William S. Moorhead said Wednesday a White House aide may have leaked a Central Intelligence Agency secret while briefing newsmen about new document - classifying procedures.

Reporters fell for a "White House sales pitch which was either an outright lie, an exercise in pure stupidity or a dangerous breach of security," the Pennsylvania Democrat said.

Moorhead, chairman of the House government information subcommittee, made his remarks to a professional group of public information officers for the federal government.

White House aide David Young told reporters at a March 8 briefing that the President's executive order on classifying documents would reduce the number of persons who can classify national security information.

He said that 5,100 persons now can classify information "top secret" in the State Department, the Defense Department and the Central Intelligence Agency, and he said that number would be reduced to 1,860 under the new order," Moorhead said.

"Either Mr. Young is in error—intentionally or unintentionally—or he had disclosed a fact that the rest of the government security apparatus takes great pains to protect," Moorhead said.

In reply to subcommittee questions, Moorhead said, State and Defense Department offi-

cials have said publicly that 1,717 of their people can use the top-secret stamp. The CIA, required by law to keep the extent of its operations secret, would not tell the subcommittee publicly "how many of their operatives have 'top secret' authority," he added.

"Has David Young leaked this important government secret? By subtracting 1,717 State and Defense Department officials with 'top secret' authority from the 5,100 listed by Mr. Young, a clever foreign agent can deduce that there are nearly 3,400 top-level operatives at the CIA, he said.

There was no immediate comment from the White House.

Moorhead said "I'm sure that Mr. Young has not breached security. He is a very security-minded person. I think he is engaging in the White House public relations program to sell its new classification system. I do know that it is a PR program, pure and simple, and not an exercise in government information," Moorhead said.

"This is a clear fact because no public information officers of the federal government were asked to comment on the draft of the new classification order. It was, in fact, written by classifiers, for classifiers, and will only perpetuate the security classification management bureaucracy without dealing with the real problems of the system as a whole," Moorhead said.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.
TRIBUNE

MAR 21 1972
M - 240,275
S - 674,302

CIA'S hand is still in the till

Two years ago, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee learned that American foreign-aid funds were being used to pay for the Central Intelligence Agency's military operations in Laos. A few months later, Dr. John Hannah, administrator of the Agency for International Development, told an interviewer, "I have to admit that this is true." After repeated protests from senators over the use of AID funds by the CIA, however, Hannah wrote to Sen. Edward Kennedy that "effective at the beginning of fiscal year 1972, all of the AID financing with which you have been concerned will be terminated."

But it wasn't. According to a report by the General Accounting Office, the congressional investigating body, nearly half of the U.S. funds appropriated to help civilian victims of the war in Laos are still being diverted to the CIA's secret guerrilla army in that country. The report, a summary of which was made public by Kennedy

Saturday, showed that about \$2.5 million in public-health funds administered by AID are being diverted each year. Moreover, congressional sources indicated that another accounting-office report, expected later this month, will disclose that AID's refugee-assistance programs in Laos have also been diverted to military uses by the CIA.

Despite administration assurances to the contrary, then, the CIA still has its hand in the non-military foreign-aid till. Three explanations for that seem possible. One is that AID's administrator didn't know what was going on in his own agency. Another is that he deliberately misled the Senate. The third is that the administration, after Hannah's letter was written, decided to resume the financing of CIA military activities with AID funds, but didn't bother telling the Senate about it. In any case, some corrective measures are in order.

'I am penniless' says spy's wife

By GUY RAIS

MRS MAUREEN BINGHAM, 35, wife of the Portsmouth Naval officer jailed for 21 years for selling secrets to the Russians, said yesterday she was "penniless," and had debts of £1,000. She would be applying for social security to keep herself and her four children.

As Mrs Bingham continued "resting" in the country, two senior detectives who investigated the case of Sub-Lt Bingham, met representatives of the Director of Public Prosecutions at Scotland Yard.

The detectives, Det. Chief Insp. John Chilcott, CID head at Havant, Hants., and Det. Chief Insp. Norman Hughes, of the Special Branch, are investigating the role which Mrs Bingham claims to have played in the case.

After her husband was sentenced at Winchester Crown Court on Monday, Mrs Bingham said in statements to the Press and on television that she had gone to the Russian Embassy in London to offer her husband's services as a spy, adding: "I shall never know why I was not charged as well. It was all my fault."

Mrs Bingham repeated yesterday that she would welcome police investigations into her role, but detectives have no plans as yet to interview her.

"Not guilty" plea

She said: "I want to prove that my husband passed nothing of value to the Russians. If I go to prison as a result I will accept my sentence, although I will not plead guilty as he did."

"Neither my husband nor I have done anything to merit the savage sentence he received. I want to make public everything I know."

Mrs Bingham said as well as debts of £1,000 she had heavy hire purchase commitments for furniture.

"Since my husband was jailed his naval pay has stopped and there is nothing coming in. I have already seen a welfare officer, who told me I would be eligible for social security."

Mrs Bingham said she and her husband had got into debt during the eight months he was on an officers' training course.

"At that time he was receiving £25 a week as a petty officer. But he had to keep up appearances in the mess and his bills were about £30 a month."

"I had to dress up to attend social engagements. We could not stay in our married quarters after he was commissioned and we had to borrow £2,000 for a house deposit and other costs."

"My husband's pay increased to £50 a week, but he was paying £36 a month mortgage and hire purchase commitments of £25 a week."

She said after they began working for the Russians more money came in and they decided to change their house as it was too small.

"We moved into a detached house which cost £8,000, getting another loan from the bank. We made about £900 profit on the sale of the first house, but it was swallowed up in costs we incurred in the move. The mortgage also increased to £58 a month."

Selling home

Mrs Bingham said she planned to sell the house and hoped any profit would pay off her debts and enable herself and the children to move to a smaller home "and start afresh."

Asked if she had a reply to criticism made of her conduct, Mrs Bingham said: "Tell those who criticise to wait and see the outcome. Everyone is saying that David passed secrets to the Russians, which is not true."

Reminded that the Attorney-General had said in court that the secrets Bingham had passed were "almost beyond price," and that the Judge had told Bingham it was a "monstrous betrayal of his country's secrets," Mrs Bingham said: "I still maintain that neither David nor I had any real value to the Russians."

SPIES IN THE NAVY

THERE IS PUBLIC CONCERN, and a degree of bafflement, about several aspects of the case of Sub-Lieut BINGHAM, the 31-year-old naval officer who was sentenced on Monday to 21 years' imprisonment for selling secrets to the Russians. The court was told that one document he gave them was "almost beyond price." Apparently, though details on this were vague, it contained operational and tactical instructions to the Fleet in case of war. The first question in the public mind, therefore, is how so junior an officer came to be in unsupervised possession of such material. He is also said to have passed information about sonar and nuclear depth charges. Russian espionage has always concentrated heavily on the Royal Navy, because anti-submarine techniques would be crucial in any major conflict. Just how effective is the system for controlling secret documents at HMS Vernon, where BINGHAM attended an anti-submarine warfare course?

The Bingham case further suggests that any security and anti-espionage system which bases itself on automatically being beware of certain categories of persons—homosexuals, members of extreme political parties, and so on—can easily prove worthless. BINGHAM apparently just did it for the money to help pay off his mortgage. Beyond being in debt, he fitted into no obviously suspect "category"—rather the contrary. Perhaps the Services should pay more attention to the financial status of junior officers—at least if they handle secrets. Another puzzling feature is the role of Mrs BINGHAM. Yesterday's announcement that the Director of Public Prosecutions has asked the police to make immediate inquiries into her role, following her statements to the Press and on television, adds to the mystification. Had not such inquiries already been made? What did they yield, and why should new ones now be needed? Parliament and public need to be given some answers to their misgivings.

PENKOVSKY SECRETS DEMAND

By RICHARD BEESTON
in Washington

A REPUBLICAN presidential candidate filed a suit against the Pentagon yesterday to force publication of the Penkovsky "special collection" Papers which he claimed related to current Russian plans in case of nuclear war against America.

The move coincided with an announcement by President Nixon yesterday ordering the declassification of large quantities of secret documents, but not specifically referring to the Penkovsky Papers.

Mr John Ashbrook, an Ohio member of the House of Representatives, said the papers contained Soviet top-secret doctrine for nuclear war, and long-range strategic plans which the American people had a right to know about.

The papers were provided to British intelligence — which passed them on to Washington — by a Russian intelligence officer, Col Oleg Penkovsky, who was reported to have been executed by the Russians in 1963.

Mr Ashbrook, a conservative, said that those papers which accurately predicted the Soviet nuclear build-up had been published, but not the "special collection" dealing with specific Soviet strategic intentions against America.

Highest classification

He released a copy of a letter from Mr Lawrence Eagleburger, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defence, acknowledging that the "special collection" contained material of the "highest classification, extremely relevant to current Soviet strategic doctrine and war plans."

Mr Eagleburger said that in all likelihood Russia was still trying to determine which of their secrets Penkovsky had given away. It would not be in America's interest to assist them.

But Mr Ashbrook contended that the only purpose served by continued secrecy "is to keep the American people from knowing what the men in the Kremlin have known for all these 10 years. It is the right of the American people to know, and to know just how the Nixon Administration plans to protect them."

Many abuses

In his statement from the White House yesterday Mr Nixon promised to "lift the veil of secrecy which now enshrouds altogether too many papers." The secret classification of documents did "not meet the standard of an open and democratic society."

The "many abuses" of the security system would no longer be tolerated. Classification frequently served to conceal bureaucratic mistakes.